



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,179	03/25/2004	William O. Camp JR.	9314-68	6824

54414 7590 04/18/2007  
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 37428  
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

SAMS, MATTHEW C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/809,179

Applicant(s)

CAMP, WILLIAM O.

Examiner

Matthew C. Sams

Art Unit

2617

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 22 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
LESTER G. KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the applicant's argument regarding the definition of a pointer command and a pointer, the applicant has cited a wikipedia article from March 14, 2007 (Page 9). The article is not considered by the examiner because it does not represent a view of the art from March 25, 2004 or earlier than the filing date of the application.

In response to the applicant's argument regarding "a pointer is visually and functionally distinguishable over the control buttons and menus described by Zhang" (Page 10), the examiner disagrees. The applicant is not claiming "a pointer", but a "pointer command".

In response to the applicant's argument regarding claims 1 & 16 that Zhang "does not appear to include any disclosure related to a user interface coupled to the controller wherein the user interface is configured to accept user input of pointer commands and wherein the controller and transmitter are configured to transmit the pointer commands over the wireless link to the remote electronic display" (Page 10), the examiner disagrees. Zhang teaches a PDA that receives and builds a GUI from a remote device over a wireless link based upon the available features on the remote device. (Page 2 [0027-0032] and Page 3 [0040-0042]) Further, Zhang teaches the GUI is configured to accept user input (Page 5 [0062]) of pointer commands (i.e. play, pause), transmitting the pointer commands (Fig. 3) over the wireless link to the remote electronic display. (Pages 4-5 [0060-0063]) Therefore, Zhang meets the limitations of claims 1 & 16.

In response to the applicant's arguments regarding claims 10 & 25, that DuVal "does not appear to include any disclosure related to an electronic display device having an Internet browser configured to receive image data and pointer commands from a handheld electronic device", the examiner disagrees. DuVal teaches a PDA (Fig. 1 [11]), with image data (Page 1 [0008]) to be transmitted to a display device (Fig. 1 [10]) and pointer commands (received by the PDA after an interrogation of the display device (Page 2 [0016]) in order control the display by the PDA. (Page 2 [0016] "internet access device 11, in addition to controls integrated into the display device 10, can be used for user control"). Therefore, DuVal meets the limitations of claims 10 & 25.

In response to the applicant's argument regarding the definition of mark-up language, the applicant has cited a wikipedia article from March 14, 2007 (Page 12). The article is not considered by the examiner because it does not represent a view of the art from March 25, 2004 or earlier than the filing date of the application.